

REMARKS

The Office Action dated November 2, 2006, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response thereto. Claims 1-9 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-6 and 8-9 are amended. Support for the subject matter of the amendments can be found in the specification at, for example, page 13, lines 19-25. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 5 and 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1 and 8-9 are amended, and now fulfill the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e)/103(a) over Vorobiev (U.S. Patent No. 6,651,063). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, Vorobiev fails to disclose or suggest a marketing support system for allowing a supplier that manufactures and sells a mechanical component having a rolling element and a sliding bearing that includes a communication device of a supplier connected to an open network and including technical information service means, sales agency introduction means for introducing the sales agency, and a communication device for the sales agency connected to the open network that includes order processing means and a selection and purchasing means that allow the purchaser to access the communication device of the supplier over the open network to select and

purchase the mechanical component from one of the at least one sales agency, as recited in independent claim 1.

The Patent Office alleges that several portions of the subject matter of independent claim 1 recite functional limitations. However, the claims are now amended to more clearly recite structural features, and Vorobiev fails to disclose, suggest or render obvious the claimed features of independent claim 1.

Vorobiev teaches an information storage and management system to facilitate organization of information with little effort on the part of the recipient (Abstract). Moreover, Vorobiev teaches two different systems 310 and 410 (Figs. 4 and 5) that can be used with either business-to-business transactions in Fig. 4 or business-to-customer transactions in Fig. 5. Moreover, the Patent Office appears to identify the claimed “supplier” with the CD player manufacturer 314 of Vorobiev, and appears to identify the claimed “sales agency” with the car manufacturer 312 in Vorobiev. The Patent Office also appears to identify the claimed “purchaser” with the customer 412 in Fig. 5 of Vorobiev. However, a closer examination of Fig. 5 indicates that the customer 412 obtains information from the car dealer 414, not from the car manufacturer 312. In fact, Vorobiev introduces four different parties instead of the three different parties claimed which are the supplier, the at least one sales agency and the purchaser. Although Vorobiev also teaches integrating the two systems illustrated in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5, such an integration merely results in having the customer 412 purchase an automobile from the car dealer 414, and the car manufacturer 312 may incorporate information from the purchase into an Information Pack 418, which may then be received by the car dealer 414 and stored in the dealer’s User Data Repository 528 (column 17, lines 9-43).

However, Vorobiev does not teach that the customer 412 accesses the CD player manufacturer 314 or the car manufacturer 312 in order to perform a purchase.

Accordingly, the combination of the systems illustrated in Figs. 4 and 5 of Vorobiev fails to arrive at the subject matter of the claimed invention because Vorobiev fails to disclose or suggest that the purchaser accesses the communication device of the supplier over the open network to select and purchase the mechanical component from one of the at least one sales agency, as recited in independent claim 1.

Furthermore, Vorobiev fails to disclose or suggest an agency introduction means for introducing the sales agency to the purchaser because Vorobiev does not teach that the car manufacturer 312 is introduced to the customer 412 (Fig. 4, Col. 16, lines 1-60). Also, although Vorobiev teaches that the car manufacturer 312 can communicate via a communication link to the CD manufacturer 314 (Col. 16, lines 23-25) or that the purchaser 412 has access to a dynamic link related to a purchased automobile to obtain information about troubleshooting tips or reminders as to how to use the CD player (Col. 16, lines 15-22), Vorobiev fails to disclose or suggest that the purchaser 412 has access to the car manufacturer 312 or the CD manufacturer 314 to perform a purchase via purchasing means. Accordingly, Vorobiev fails to disclose, suggest or render obvious the features of independent claim 1.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 1, and its dependent claims, are patentable over Vorobiev. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e)/103(a) is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing Attorney Dkt.**

No. 100725-00051.

Respectfully submitted,



Tarik M. Nabi
Registration Number 55,478

Customer Number 004372
ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: 202-857-6000
Fax: 202-638-4810

TMN/elz